

THE OFFICE ACTION

In the Office Action issued on April 21, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,240,456 to Teng et al. ("Teng").

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully considered the Office Action issued on April 21, 2004. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in light of the above amendments and the following comments.

A. The Pending Claims Are Not Anticipated by Kurozasa

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Teng. Applicants respectfully traverse.

As amended, claim 1 now more clearly recites that the first (proprietary) and second (commercial) print spoolers are part of the network print server and are distinct from the print spooler present in the network client machine through which the print job originates. That is, the present invention is directed to a partial print provider that allows interface between two print spoolers in the network print server, allowing a proprietary spooler to leverage off of a commercial print spooler.

Teng fails to disclose such an arrangement. That is, Teng only discloses a DLL for allowing the system spooler 74 of the server 49 to communicate with the printer 50. The second print spooler discussed by the Examiner 64, is actually the print spooler for the network client machine 20. This is different from the arrangement in the present application, in which the two print server spoolers, 22 and 72, are distinct from the print client spooler 14. Thus, because Teng fails to disclose or suggest a partial print provider permitting a first server spooler from interfacing with a second server spooler, it fails to anticipate the present claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and comments, Applicants submit that claims 1-7 are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request

Application No. 09/726,233
Amendment dated July 16, 2004
Reply to Office Action of April 21, 2004


early notification of such allowance. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned to attempt to resolve any such issues.

If any fee is due in conjunction with the filing of this response, Applicants authorize deduction of that fee from Deposit Account 24-0037.

Respectfully submitted,

**FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & MCKEE, LLP**

Date: July 16, 2004



Joseph E. Waters, Reg. No. 50,427
Joseph D. Dreher, Reg. No. 37,123
1100 Superior Avenue
Seventh Floor
Cleveland, OH 44114-2518
216/861-5582